Gulf of Mexico Regional Sediment Management Master Plan (GRSMMP) Workshop
March 8-9, 2007
5 Rivers Center, Mobile, Alabama

1. A workshop for the Gulf of Mexico Regional Sediment Management Master Plan (GRSMMP) was held on March 8th and 9th in Mobile, Alabama at the 5 Rivers Center. The GRSMMP workshop was held in coordination with the Gulf of Mexico Alliance Regional Restoration Coordination Team State Workshop for Alabama and Mississippi. The agenda for the GRSMMP portion of the workshop is included as Attachment 1. After introductions a brief overview of the GRSMMP effort was presented along with the workshop objectives which included the following:

- Become more familiar with the regional sediment transport processes relating to RRCT activities
- State-of-the-science for sediment studies in the GOM
- Discuss, understand, and record the key issues involved in managing sediment resources related to RRCT actions
- Develop a better understanding of potential sediment resources from the federal dredging program
- Establish a consensus across the Gulf states to provide guidance towards the direction and development of the regional plan
- Develop a strategy to elevate and motivate the regional master plan

2. The workshop proceeded with a presentation by Dr. Jeff Waters of ERDC on regional sediment transport processes. The presentation provided the basic foundation of sediment transport processes related to the regional sediment management approach. There were some important discussions raised during this session pertaining to sediment processes relative to sediment management. In particular, concerns were expressed of the existence of the amount and need of information on sediment influx and transport to provide an adequate understanding towards effective sediment management. For instance, pertaining to historic actions that have channelized the Mississippi River, it is believed that such actions are subsequently starving wetlands and affecting the supply of sand to the Gulf beaches. It is important to understand these processes in order to plan and make management decisions on how to deal with these issues. How do you go about identifying data gaps that define the sediment transport processes that would allow us to make accurate assessments of these situations? Such information is also important in evaluating the behavior of a project to predict how placed sediment will behave as well as other consequential impacts. Discussions also identified the importance of understanding how structures affect regional sediment transport processes. It is essential to know the life spans of sediment structures and how should they fit in the sediment management approach.

3. The next session on the agenda provided a summary of the Scientific Assessment Workshop that was held in St. Petersburg, Florida in December of 2006. A summary of the scientific assessment work is included as Attachment 2. The purpose of this workshop was to 1) bring together experts in the field to identify existing information about sediment sources (sand and finer materials), their availability and characteristics; 2) assess the availability of sediment

budgets and sediment transport process models; and 3) determine the availability, management and sharing of sediment and data/ information for the purposes of supporting development of the GRSMMP. Dr. Waters discussed two basic tracks in which the scientific assessment workshop evolved; sediment resources and sediment needs. In reality, there is probably a greater need for sediment than there are resources available. For management purposes, it is important to be able to assess how much is available prior to the implementation of projects. A key point during this session was the purpose and need for regional sediment budgets. It is important to constantly update and populate existing sediment databases with information when it becomes available. Calibrated regional sediment budgets allow for a better understanding of processes and where the sediment is going which in turn provides for more efficient management decisions. It was also pointed out that existing programs such as the National Shoreline Management Study ongoing at ERDC is an excellent source that addresses coastal baselines, historical shoreline behavior, and shoreline erosion rates. There is also valuable research being conducted at USGS dealing with sediment resources in the open coast.

4. The next workshop session focused on identifying the problems, opportunities, and priorities that must be considered in the development of the sediment management master plan which will lead to some understanding towards evaluating sediment needs. This part of the workshop was facilitated by Dr. Mark Dunning. Prior to the workshop, a questionnaire was sent out to the state leads and asked that they be prepared to provide responses to the questions during the discussions. The questionnaire is included as Attachment 3. To engage the group on these issues, Dr. Dunning posed a series of other thought provoking questions to help lead the discussion toward answering some of issues identified in the questionnaire. These were:

- What must the GRSMMP do for you?
- What should it focus on in terms of solving problems and issues?
- How can the Federal agencies help you in this process?

The State's key points and concerns expressed during the discussions were recorded on flip charts, transcribed into a WORD document, and included here as Attachment 4. There were many key points discussed that must be addressed in this process and have been recorded for the record. However, the dominant theme in the discussions dealt with a lack of emphasis on environmental benefits within policies and authorizations. It was recommended that more flexibility be built into the Federal Standard to allow more beneficial use options. A revision of the federal standard should not be worded as simply requiring greater emphasis on nvironmental benefits in cost-benefit analysis, but rather should emphasize in specific terms the need for greater effort to quantify the economic value of ecosystem services provided by environmental improvements. Other related issues identified lack of available funds to conduct restoration projects and length of the authorization and permitting process. The overall process should promote a united front on sediment use when making policy recommendations to the policy makers.

5. The next topic on the agenda was a session for the Corps Districts around the Gulf to present and discuss the dredging activities within their perspectives Districts. This topic was recommended during previous conference calls because materials from dredging projects can be a valuable resource for many types of restoration projects. Representatives from each District

presented where dredging is taking place, sediment type, dredging volumes, and disposal practices for project within their jurisdiction. It many cases, it was shown that some beneficial use practices are already being employed. A recommendation to the Corps from the workshop was made to devise a means for better sediment data access and management for dredging activities. The Corps is looking into methods to better manage this information and make it available to those who need it.

6. The agenda moved on to next session which dealt with gathering input from the group pertaining to the direction and form of GRSMMP. Discussions for this session were again facilitated by Dr. Dunning. A primary consideration at this point is to identify the next key steps in moving the plan forward and how to accomplish this in the remaining one and a half years. Specific comments during the discussions were recoded on flip charts, transcribed into WORD, and included as Attachment 5. The following summarizes the discussions:

- Develop and maintain protocols for timely communication among team members for more effective coordination. It's important to include the right people at the right time within and across agencies, both federal and state.

- Continue with the questionnaires. Two questionnaires were distributed to the states and interagency team prior to the workshop. It was pointed out that the original questionnaire might be a bit ambitious to cover at the workshop but did identify questions to help the states with problems and solutions. It was decided that it be condensed to 4 or 5 questions that can directly be addressed during discussions at the workshop. It is still requested that the states complete both questionnaires for purposes of documenting their positions on these issues. Future conference calls should concentrate on each of the issue areas or steps and be devoted to a section of the plan development. It would be beneficial to distribute the question being addressed far enough in advance of the conference call to allow the states to get input from other appropriate contacts from their states.

- How should the Master Plan be structured? Individual state plans should be combined into a single comprehensive plan that reflects the states regional recommendations. The Plan must demonstrate to policy makers what is required on a regional level and contain a set of policy recommendations for the Alliance as a whole. Recommendations were that a working website be established and could evolve more towards reaching the public. Should involve the outreach group.

- Involve other stakeholders such as the ports and the National Park Service.

- Continue to identify information needs and provide inks to where information resides; e.g if planning a restoration project show links to other information that might be useful.

- Establish sub-teams with appropriate expertise to concentrate on specific sections of the Plan. Potential sub-teams identified are: sediment resources and studies; policy and funding; ecological benefits; and data management.

- Use existing resources. Corps authorities Technical Note, RSM Primer, and upcoming National Dredging Team report coming out this spring/summer.

- Determine the most important thing to concentrate on first. It was recommended that we concentrate on the first three questions of the questionnaire and finalize state responses with additional state staff input.

- Defined a united front to Congress to make beneficial use a part of every project in the Gulf where it makes sense and use environmental benefits more in the cost/benefit analysis

- Explain the federal standard as it is now and recommend how it can be made more flexible for the implementation of regional sediment management.

7. The final wrap-up session was directed to the strawman and tasks that was pulled together by Cherie Price of the New Orleans District. It was asked that the team look at Cherie's strawman and provide input to make sure that everything is included that needs to be and how it can be refined to reflect the states' needs. During future conference calls a focus area will be selected for discussion and a subgroup considered to pulling together and creating this piece of the Plan. The next GRSMMP conference call will be Thursday, April 5 at 2:00 central.

Gulf of Mexico Regional Sediment Management Master Plan (GRSMMP) Workshop
March 8-9, 2007
Agenda

THUSDAY, MARCH 8

1:30 - 1:45	Intro, Objectives, & Overview of GRSMMP	Larry Parson - Mobile District
1:45 - 2:15	Regional Sediment Processes	Jeff Waters - ERDC
2:15 - 2:45	Scientific Assessment Workshop Summary	Jeff Waters - ERDC
2:45 - 3:05	Break	
3:05 - 5:00	State RSM (Facilitated Discussion) Problems, Opportunities, Priorities, and Sediment Needs	Mark Dunning (facilitator)
5:00	Adjourn	

FRIDAY, MARCH 9

USACE Dredging Activities

8:00 - 8:25	Galveston District	Bob Heinly
8:25 - 8:50	New Orleans District	Ed Creef
8:50 - 9:15	Mobile District	Larry Parson
9:15 - 9:40	Jacksonville District	Jonas White
9:40 - 10:05	Dredging Activities - Questions and Open Discussion	Group
10:05 - 10:25	Break	
10:25 - 11:10	Direction and Form of GRSMMP	Mark Dunning (facilitator)
11:10 - 11:30	Wrap-up (Action items, next meeting, next workshop)	Larry Parson
11:30	Adjourn	

Attachment 1

Science Assessment Workshop in Support of the
Gulf Regional Sediment Management Master Plan
December 5-6, 2006

1. Approximately 30 participants attended a December 2006 workshop to discuss scientific and technical information currently available to support development of a GRSMMP. The participants included the USGS, USACE, MMS, States of Louisiana, Florida, and Texas, and University of New Orleans, and several consultants. A list of workshop attendees is attached.

2. Discussions at the workshop focused on:
- identifying existing information about sediment sources (sand and finer materials), their availability and characteristics;
- the availability of sediment budgets and sediment transport process models; and
- the availability, management and sharing of sediment and data/ information for the purposes of supporting development of the GRSMMP.

3. Generally, there is considerable information about sand and sediment resources in the Gulf, but this information is not all readily available and there is currently no comprehensive picture of the status of these resources Gulf-wide or within state boundaries and most sub-regions. The identification of the supplies and demands for sediment resource material seems to be a higher near-term priority for the states than development of sediment budgets and sediment system process information and models. However, it was acknowledged that the process information is indeed important for designing and implementing sustainable restoration and other projects. Sediment budgets inform sediment management plans. SBAS was noted as one accounting tool; notion of static sediment budgets vs long-term transport budgets.

4. Several participants noted that there is an enormous need for sediment resources for a range of purposes in coastal restoration: barrier islands, marshes, ridges, coastal protection. Some noted that "sand wars" are on horizon because there are more needs/users than resources. Many viable sediment deposits may not be available due to accessibility, safety, costs to access and transport.

5. Access to sediment data will be key. The USGS, USACE and MMS have the most data in the Federal community and need to work on better coordination of data. Instead of a centralized database, linking datasets was recommended. Several alternatives for access portals to data were discussed. PHINS has been developed as a pilot effort for the Habitat ID group; it enables the USGS, NOAA, and the USACE to share data and information without a centralized database.
More detailed notes:

6. States: There is considerable variability among the participating states as far as information about sediment sources, sediment processes and data management.

Florida –
- Sand sharing processes are in place to link dredging sand from inlets and placement along eroding shorelines, including post hurricane recovery. State law requires beach quality

sand to be returned to beaches from navigational dredging except at defined "deep water ports," though actually even most of that dredging is placed on the beach if good enough.

- Sand quality issues – panhandle region demands very white sand; in most of the rest of the State, turtle nesting needs determine sand resource characteristics and placement slopes. Have an evaluation framework for evaluating native beach and source materials. Finer materials go upland (Tampa) or offshore (Miami).
- Some of the dredged material islands used in the 1980s cannot be used due to migratory bird use. Dredged holes in Tampa Bay – fill some anoxic ones, keep some for fish habitat. Have offloaded material at designated sites for future use elsewhere. Noted that Silent Inspector will improve dredging data and its availability.
- Beach nourishment projects include federal and non-federal. There are about 201 miles of federal projects constructed, for which the state costs shares the non-federal portion with the locals, and 82 miles of state/local only projects in the state.
- Potentially a shortage of sand in the Southeast region; many counties are looking at some of the MMS deposits on east coast – anticipate "sand wars," including opposing views of residents, fishermen, environmental interests. By Congressional directive, cannot go to out of the county for sand.
- State is collecting additional sediment resource data, including descriptive geological information.
- Data and information about sediment resources is available from permit applications and tracking, engineering reports, monitoring databases, FSU Beaches and Shores Resource Center; the State contracts for lidar and aerial imagery. The Regional Off-Shore Sand Surveys (ROSS) – started in panhandle – provide a standard format database for geological information; not only grain size, but quartz vs carbonate, friable, will it cement, etc. Feels FL database is sufficient for their work
- Have data on "critically eroding shorelines"; about 101.6 miles restored and maintained along Gulf coast #]; do not feel they need a state-wide sediment management plan or need for information about finer sediment resources availability; little demand for finer material to date.

Louisiana - RSM rationale: to effectively manage the demand for the large volume of sediment/sand needed to restore sustainability of LA coastal zone for numerous projects – barrier island and marsh restoration, coastal protection levees. Key resource issues – understand the sediment resources (availability, demand i.e. compare total project needs vs total resources.)

Components of Louisiana RSM Plan:

1. Regional evaluation of resources in GOM & lower Mississippi R
2. Delineation of areas which are off limits / restricted / reserved (e.g., Oil and gas pipelines on Ship Shoals; restricted areas reserved for future pipelines to keep access to the resource; implement plan for sharing the sediment – levees, BI restoration or other purposes)
3. Protect/Preserve delineated sand/ sediment deposit
4. Set up priorities to ensure proper and justifiable (scientifically & economically) distribution of sand/sediment resources to different projects
5. Implement plan for sharing sediment/sand resources and a rational management scheme for utilizing sediment/sand resources

6. Avoid conflict of interest among various interested parties (Sand Wars?) and arbitrate the conflicting interests
7. Ensure proper environmental safeguard/trade offs
8. Minimize cost by providing organized resources information available in a GIS database for Planners/Engineers

LA RSM – STRATEGIES:

1. Clearing House State: LDNR
2. Short-Term and Long-Term strategy
3. Evaluation & assessment of offshore sand resources –MMS Coop
4. Evaluation of nearshore & LMR resources
5. Geo-scientific data management - Louisiana Sediment Resources Database (LASARD)

- Protocol to explore of offshore sand/sediment; Research vessel *RV Coastal Profiler* fitted with *state-of-the-art* acoustic remote sensing equipments ; Geo-technical investigation for exploration and evaluation of sand in various locales (e.g. Trinity & Tiger Shoals, Sabine, off Terrebonne); Sediment budget for individual projects [available? Planned?]
- Potential sand locations: Delta front sand bodies – shoals; Abandoned delta complexes; Paleo-distributaries; Paleo-interdistributaries; Ebb and flood shoals in modern and relict inlets; Fluvial Sand (Mississippi River)
- Challenges in sand exploration - **i**naccessibility of barrier islands; Difficulty in finding adequate quantity & restoration-quality sand in a muddy deltaic environment; Oil & gas infrastructures and related buffers; Cultural Resources issues; Impact of Hurricanes; Environmental concerns

- Data Management - **LASARD - Concept & Overall Objective -** A spatial database for geological, environmental, and associated data relevant to both coastal and offshore sand resources with reference to Louisiana's ongoing effort to mitigate the effects of coastal land loss; Boreholes/ Core Logs; Bathymetric data; Sediment/Grain Size; High Resolution Seismic Profiles; Side Scan Sonar Data; Magnetic data; Lidar data Oyster Leases Man made structures; Oil & Gas Infrastructures; Debris. *Long-Term Activities Supported by LASARD* - Locating sediment/sand for barrier restoration; Delineation of aquatic habitat to be protected; Provide inputs for numerical models; Assessment of oyster leases and relocation sites; Restoration planning to avoid human infrastructure.

-Listed 13 restoration projects w/quantity needs and sources and whether they are CWPPRA, LCA, other info – does not include sediment needed for levees – Corps plan due in end of 07; State released their preliminary plan this week – mostly focused on restoration;

<u>Texas</u> – has initiated a number of sediment management efforts to support:

- Developing consensus on standards for known data collections and new data to be collected for sand source investigations along the Texas Gulf coast.
- Identification of potential sand sources available for future investigation
- Identifying future goals and needs for sand sources

- Identifying sediment that can be used for restoration. Held a meeting in November 2006 with counties and consulting firms, identified a few sand sources; expect to have a good product in 3-5 years.
- Subsidence is also an issue.
- Working w/ MMS to look for post-storm sand sources, and plan to team w/LA DNR create a basic data base, digitizing data.
- Plan to develop a Texas dredging plan – meet w/all regulatory agencies and ID dredging projects (Corps and other) early on and have the regulatory requirements in place to use the material beneficially – all the ports and navigation districts behind this – CIAP vs dredging; potentially use fine material and put sand on top. State has agreements with Corps for maintaining placement areas, stockpiling material so it is available for future use and not lost.
- Need to keep some sediments in the system, can't mine it all. Need smart use of sediment resources and consideration of environmental impacts.

- Data Management –TX is developing a database, modeled after FL ROSS database; pilot in Galveston area; GIS team will meet with FL for ROSS database – adapted to their situation (e.g. no carbonate beaches, but have other issues like contaminants; also resource agencies want to protect important habitat that needs to be preserved.)

University – UNO

- Delta Lobe studies; Barrier island studies for State of Louisiana – due in 2007; also a recent sediment survey. Sediment system in LA dynamic with influences from river systems, Corps dredging, mining companies, diversions, other; need a tool for management.
- Look at flexibility in using sediment resources to better address different use needs. Some some uses tolerate heterogeneous material, other uses may require homogeneous quantities with specific characteristics.
- Sediments from submerged channels
- Some shoals are composed of multiple deposits with different characteristics. Shore-based detached ridges.
- Need to consider the usability of the material AND the effects of removing large quantities from the littoral system.
- Chandeleur islands are showing some recovery; restoration projects west of mouth are showing greater resilience
- Some areas are bi-directional systems. Every reach has different sources, sinks, rates of flux; not all shoals are the same and not all channels are the same.

GRSMMP State Questionnaire

Problems, Opportunities, Priorities, and Sediment Needs Session

1. Considering your existing practices for projects involving restoration, conservation, and environmental protection, what are the primary concerns in your state involving RSM (i.e. wetland loss, beach erosion, habitat restoration, etc.) and how can the GRSMMP improve the planning process?

2. What do you perceive to be the key problems and issues that impede regional sediment management in your state and where should efforts be concentrated to support the regional management approach? Are their issues involving regional sediment management across political boundaries?

3. What are the regulatory, policy, and funding constraints that impede regional restoration efforts and sediment management in your area of interest?

4. How important is the establishment of a sediment budget in understanding the sediment processes in relation to managing and planning projects? What do you perceive your sediments needs to be in the near term (10 years) and longer term (50 years) and what sediment type is most desirable?

Direction of GRSMMP Session

1. What actions, as a group, should be taken as a result of this workshop?

2. What are your recommendations to establish key steps to advance the implementation of the GRSMMP? How should we move forward and promote the recommendations that will come out of the GRSMMP?

Gulf of Mexico Regional Sediment Management Master Plan (GRSMMP) Workshop

State Regional Sediment Management Problems, Opportunities, Priorities and Sediment Needs

Facilitated Discussion
8 March 2007

Focus of Discussion: To be defined as a "success" what must the Master Plan do for you?

- How should it help existing practices?
- What key problems/issues must it address?
- What should be the focus for federal R&D? Sediment budgets?
- Other guidance?

State views in response to GRSMMP State Questions

Question 1 – Primary concerns involving RSM?

Alabama

- Proper sand by-passing at tidal inlets
- Habitat restoration – use all sediment types
- Coordination of dredging cycles with restoration project permitting cycles
- Include beneficial use options in all public notices
- Prior characterization of sediment quantity, quality, type, amount, and time sequence
- Look at benefit – cost requirements – policy adjustment needed to rethink least cost requirement
    - Can we demonstrate that B/C procedures are creating problems?
    - More weight needs to be given to environmental benefits
- ID natural vs. man-induced sediments (CA is doing this)

Florida

- Understand the natural dynamics of coastlines (but, what is "natural"?)
- Man-made alterations need to understand these processes and perhaps make adjustments
- Understand sediment impacts – match the properties of sediments to the needs
- Need for care in mixing sediments to avoid needless contamination
    - R&D needed? New techniques for separating sediments?
    - Better management as sediment is being disposed of to prevent needless contamination

Mississippi

- Determine availability of suitable material for beneficial uses
- Coordinate dredging with beneficial use projects
- Is there sufficient material to rebuild the barrier islands?
- Match up material to projects – but can we keep it there?
- Frequency of need of beach nourishment – how quickly must it be done again?
- Define how context is changing – ship channels, natural processes, etc.
    - What is the "future without" condition?
    - Comment: Ports are key stakeholders – they are looking for the cheapest cost for disposal. They need to be involved.
    - Port of Houston, Port of New York have tried new ways of addressing dredge material disposal issues. Ports may be open to new thinking.
    - Redefining the B/C accounting rules can also help adjust thinking about least cost. Attention needs to be given to authorities, beach nourishment policies, and accounting rules to broaden thinking and include environmental services, and broader take on economics (e.g. tourism) to obtain greater flexibility in funding beneficial uses
- Environmental issues with suspended materials in sediments
    - Consider stockpiling, but this is expensive

Texas

- Find places to put sediment – TX has more sediment than it needs
- Sediment islands become bird and turtle habitat and then there are problems using the material – scheduling differences and environmental concerns ("Dredging tourism?")
- Airborne suspension of fine sediments creates air quality problems (Brownsville disposal is likely to create this problem with economic and health issues)
- What about private dredging projects? (Creative use of publicity and regulatory process may be the answer)
- Emerging project "Tidal Pass" – could this be a potential case study?
- Problems with scheduling of dredging and placement of material. Problems are caused by many factors including contractual constraints, wildlife issues such as bird nesting season, migration season, turtle nesting, as well as tourism concerns, etc…
- The lower Texas coast has problems finding suitable places to put dredged material if it is not beneficially used. A current example is the Brazos Island Harbor project (the Brownsville Ship Channel deepening and widening) where the Port is buying land simply to place 3M cy of dredged material on it. In addition, upland placement of very fine material could cause issues with airborne particulates.
- Cost share (the federal standard) is a frequent problem. For example good quality sand dredged near South Padre Island is being disposed of offshore but the beach could use this material for renourishment had they the money to pay for it.
- Private dredging activities, often associate with oil and gas activities are also a problem. Private companies have no incentive (that I know of) to beneficially use the material.

Louisiana (Not in attendance, but as presented in answers provided to questionnaire)

- Finding sources to rebuild levees while avoiding use of "adjacent borrow" to prevent massive loss of wetlands. Need a pragmatic solution
    - Sediment load in Miss. R. – potential uses for this?
    - Need for new river channel? No scientific consensus on this
    - Need to prioritize sand uses – go for the "highest and best" uses

Question 2: Key problems and issues

Alabama

- Resolution of some ongoing litigation
- Lack of funding for sec 204 & 206
- Length and cost of sec 204 & 206
- Funds for beneficial use projects

Florida

- WQ issues – limit disposal options
- Disparity between donor sources and user requirements – need to better marry up the right needs and sources
- Information needs on resource impacts
- Cost share requirements for Continuing Authority program
- Timing issues – conflicts with environmental windows
- Least cost alternative is a constraint – need a clear formula for putting a better value on environmental benefits

Question 3: Regulatory, policy, and funding constraints

Alabama

- Funding to clear out upper river disposal areas

Question 4: Importance of sediment budgets

Alabama

- Very important to establish, but also need to understand where sediment comes from, dredging cycle and probable quantities
- Need all types of sediment
    - Research need: Is there anyone who can speak to the need to separate sediment types

Wrap-up Discussion: What is needed for success in GRSMMP?

- Promote united front on sediment use – have policy recommendations to take to policy makers
- Define the sediment system – how much, how it moves around, what's available
- Advocate for funding for beneficial use

Review of current GRSMMP objectives: Are current objectives consistent with points raised in today's discussion?

- Objectives accurately capture the points
- Need to add a bullet on need to ensure adequate funding for beneficial uses; to support R&D; for knowledge and tools
- Advance "sustainability ethic" in RSM philosophy

Direction of GRSMMP - 2nd Facilitated Session

Planning Steps
- ID Problems, Needs, and Opportunities
- Develop Objectives
- Inventory and forecast conditions
- Options
- Evaluate
- Select Recommendations

Key Steps / How to Accomplish
- Improving timely communication among team members
  - ** Concentrate conference calls on issue areas
    - Use questionnaires
    - Bring in appropriate people - experts / authority
    - States caucus ahead of time
- ID state needs - looking for common needs among states
- Examine role that USGS & other agencies can play in understanding sediment dynamics as well as other issues.
  - Define some key questions
- Get stakeholders involved
- Potential database on where dredging is occurring
  - How much
  - Where is it placed
  - How often
  - Sediment type

Master Plan
- What form should the Master Plan take?
  - Regional Plan - then up to sates to make things happen
  - Include set of recommendations
- Document that is readable by higher ups - policy and decision makers
- Page on Alliance website
  - Internal page to evolve into public accessible later
- Plan and website should summarize what's being done
  - Provide better coordination & links to other information
- Corps - develop a better way of managing dredging data

Potential Subgroups
- Corps Districts - dredging information
- Sediment Processes - Littoral & Riverine
- Authorities - IWR RSM Primer, Beneficial Use Manual
- Environmental role of sediment
- Data compatibility

Study Boundaries - How far inland to go

Note: need to prepare strawman ahead of time of conference call

Presenting Master Plan Most Effectively
- Changing the Federal Standard
- Gulf Alliance partition the Governors
- Emphasize hurricane protection aspect
- Put teeth into beneficial use, “all or nothing” funding
- Document missed and lost opportunities / problems
- Public outreach and education needs to be included in Plan
- Need to work w/ partners - can they support recommendations?
- Look for mutual benefits.